WHITNEY BELL: Hello, and welcome to the Grid Resilience Formula Grant Metrics Guidance webinar for grantees. I am Whitney Bell with ICF, and I will be your host today. First, I have a few housekeeping items for today's webinar. This Webex meeting is being recorded and may be used by the US Department of Energy. If you do not wish to have your voice recorded, please do not speak during the call. If you do not wish to have your image recorded, please turn off your camera or participate by phone. If you speak during the call or use a video connection, you are presumed consent to recording and use of your voice or image. All participants are in listen only mode.

If you have any technical issues or questions, you may type them in the chat box and select Send to Host. There will be a Q&A after today's presentation. Please submit all questions in the chat box throughout the presentation. If you need to view the live captioning, please refer to the link that will appear in the chat now.

Finally, and one of the most popular questions that we've already had come in today, we will be posting a copy of today's presentation on the Grid Resilience web page by Friday. And the recording of today's webinar will be available in about two weeks. And we will let you know when that recording is available.

With that, let's go ahead and get started. Today, we'll hear from Dave Parsons, Program Manager with the Grid Deployment Office, and Angelena Bohman, Technical Analyst with the same Grid Deployment Office. Dave, welcome. I'll go ahead and turn this over to you.

DAVE PARSONS: Great, thank you. And thank you Whitney. And good afternoon, everyone, or good morning, for those of you who are in the western part of the country. My name is Dave Parsons. I'm the supervisor for the state and tribal Grid Resilience programs

at the Grid Deployment Office. I'm going to provide a quick overview of the Grid Deployment Office and the Grid Resilience Formula grant. And then I'll turn it over to Angelena and we'll get right into it. So if we could go to the next slide, please. The Grid Deployment Office is split into three main divisions. Our program here is on the right-hand side under the grid modernization division. We provide $2.3 billion worth of funding to states, tribes, and territories, for grid resilience investments, investments that are designed to reduce the likelihood and consequence of grid outages due to extreme weather, wildfires, and other kinds of natural disasters. If we can go to the next slide, please.

So the application deadline for the first two years of funding for states and territories was at the end of May, 2023. And we just had the application deadline for all of our tribal applicants, and that was at the end of August. As of September 5, we've made awards to 37 states, 29 tribal entities, and one territory.

And the awards total over $580 million of funding. And we're continuing to make awards, so we'll do that on a rolling basis as the applications have come in. We expect to make all of the remaining state awards by the end of September. And we'll continue to make remaining territory and tribal awards throughout the fall as we process those applications. We can go to the next slide.

You can see a breakdown here of the amount of funding that we have available for the first two fiscal years. For states and territories, you can see the dark shaded states and territories in the 30 to $70 million range for those two years of funding. And if you go to the next slide, we have the funding for our tribal recipients as well. And you can see the funding there, ranging from approximately $50,000 up to $5 million, depending on the tribe.

So that's the background on the program and where we're at. And so with that, I'll turn it over to Angelena to get right into the topic for today. Thank you.

ANGELENA BOHMAN: Hi, everyone. And thank you, Dave, for the introduction. So before getting into the specifics of the reporting requirements, I wanted to spend some time providing the background and motivation for the reporting design. So first, let's take a step back and discuss why reporting matters in the first place. So as society is seeing an increase in the magnitude and frequency of weather-related outages, we're seeing an increase in the cost to operate and maintain electric infrastructure, as well as increases in the size and variability of load, and increases in low carbon and distributed energy resources. Both industry regulators and policy makers are grappling with competing energy investment needs. And they need to be able to answer the following questions.

What should be prioritized and why? What investments provide broad benefits? And what investments are most cost effective? To get to those, you need access to the right data such as, what are the investment options available to you? And how much do they cost? How well do these investments perform during disruptive events? And what is the return on investment incorporating a wide range of benefits?

So before I get any further into this discussion, I wanted to first point out where you can find the various reporting resources that we already have posted and already have available through this grant program. So both on the Grid Deployment GDO websites, and the NETL, the National Energy Technology Laboratory websites, who provide contractual support for the Grant administration, have post award resource pages. Posted on both of those pages is the Guidance for Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, Grid Resilience, Formula Grant, Metrics

Tracking document, which is horribly named, but there it is. And it is posted directly to both websites.

It is a guidance document that is written by the Grid Deployment Office on how to think about metrics tracking. And I'll discuss some of the highlights of this document in the next few slides. Next, there is the program management plan/quarterly progress report that is available on the NETL web page, which recipients will fill out every quarter. And this report keeps track of costs, milestones, and project implementation.

And then finally, there's the Annual Program Metrics and Impact Report which recipients will submit at the end of every federal fiscal year. This report will ask recipients to report information on outage performance, job creation, and community engagement related to the projects funded. The example I will provide later today will walk through how to fill out both of these templates. And finally, if you need to reference this again, the webinar is being recorded, and a link will be provided on the GDO website. So to provide some context on the design of the reporting requirements, this slide details the requirements placed on the Department of Energy when it comes to projects funded through the bipartisan infrastructure law, which is also referred to as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, IIJA.

So first, in section 40101 of IIJA, which is the creation of this grant program, there is a requirement for the Department of Energy to submit a report every two years to Congress on the following: the costs of the projects for which grants are awarded to eligible entities, the types of activities, technologies, equipment, and hardening measures funded by those grants, and the extent to which the ability of the power grid to withstand disruptive events has increased. That last one on impact is extremely challenging to do and is a large driver of

the design of the metrics in the annual report. Next, there are two executive orders related to reporting on IIJA.
The first asks for measurable outcomes for investments, and the second wants to ensure that 40% of all IIJA funding benefits disadvantaged communities. These disadvantaged communities are defined as census tracks by the White House using a set of 36 different criteria. In response to these executive orders, the Department of Energy has created baseline reporting templates for all IIJA funded projects so that they can summarize all the benefits of these projects such as job creation, job quality, and equity in funding.

So how do we translate the reporting requirements from Congress and the White House to tangible metrics that are specific to this program? Well, first we divided the metrics into three broad categories. The first are build metrics, which refer to the monetary investments, electricity infrastructure assets, and the policies and programs that are part of grid resilience projects. These metrics address those part A and B of the reporting requirements to Congress, namely the cost and type of projects, and will be found in your quarterly progress reporting templates.

Next are the impact metrics, which refer to grid resilience capabilities enabled by projects and measure the extent to which projects have reduced the likelihood and consequences of disruptive events. These help address that third requirement from Congress on measuring impact. And most of these metrics are provided or included in the annual program metrics and impact report. However, there are a few questions related to project benefits in the quarterly progress report, the QPR.
And then finally, the community and equity metrics refer to policies and programs that will be implemented to advance equity, engage communities, and create good paying jobs. And these help address the executive order requirements and predominantly are requested in the annual program metrics and

impact report with a few questions related to communities and customers targeted in projects in the QPR. So now that I have provided a rough overview of the type of metrics we want to collect, the next two slides show how to develop these metrics for your specific projects.

This metrics framework is also described in the resilience guidance document I referred to earlier. So in general, there are two possible main objectives for grid resilience, either preventing outages from occurring in the first place, or restoring power quickly after they do occur. This goal will dictate the type of investments you're interested in. For example, if you're interested in preventing outages from occurring, you may consider some system hardening measures where you are upgrading poles and wires to withstand more extreme events. Or, if you are interested in reducing restoration time, you may consider inventory or emergency response improvements, or the ability to reconfigure the system rapidly to restore power to as many customers as possible.

Next, you need to consider where to implement the resilience investment, does the project involve multiple utilities and their entire service territories, or is it focused on a select few areas within one service territory? And finally, consider why you have selected a particular area for investment. Is it because it is at high risk for certain natural disasters? Is it because it is a generally underperforming feeder with aging infrastructure? Or is it because there are critical loads on this section of the grid?

After taking these questions into consideration, we can then determine which metrics to focus in on. For example, if we're interested in preventing outages through hardening some distribution lines, then maybe consider tracking the number of miles of lines or number of poles that were hardened as a build

metric. Next, consider how the community may have benefited from this project.

Were any people hired or trained to harden these distribution lines? Do these distribution lines serve a disadvantaged community? And finally, we consider impact metrics which we suggest collecting before and after project implementation. In this example of distribution hardening which is done to prevent outages from occurring, recipients could consider measuring the number and type of outages that occur on that particular section of power lines, or the number of customers interrupted downstream of those hardened power lines. A more exhaustive list of metrics to consider is provided in the appendix of the metrics tracking guidance document.

Now let's walk through a specific example. And I will also point out that there are three other examples provided in the guidance document. So let's consider a hypothetical proposal that you could potentially see from a single subrecipient.
Let's say you have a subrecipient that is a Rural Electric Cooperative and qualifies as a small entity because they sell less than 4,000,000 megawatt hours in a year. They have 20,000 customers on their system, and their entire service territory covers 10 zip codes, 12 census tracts, five of which are considered disadvantaged communities. The technologies they have proposed are split into two project ideas.

First is replacing 10,000 old power line communication meters with radio frequency smart meters. The second project involves purchasing and installing an artificial intelligence-based vegetation management software system, which will help the utility better identify problematic vegetation areas so that they can prioritize maintaining and cutting back vegetation in those areas. This Rural Electric Cooperative proposed these projects because their service territory has several areas that experience higher than average outages due to wind, flooding,

wildfires, or hurricanes, which are all events that can cause vegetation to be uprooted and damage electricity infrastructure. These projects were also attractive to the grant recipient because they hired two new permanent employees for the meter change out, they are funding a line worker apprenticeship program through the local community college, and they engaged in an opt-in program for these new smart meters and were able to get 50% of customers to sign up.

So next, I'm going to walk through how you would take this information and actually enter it into a quarterly progress report. And I first want to clarify that we do not have the time to go over every section of the QPR. And your federal project officers through NETL can walk through the finer details as many elements of the QPR are standard in federal contracting. I'm instead going to focus on the components of the QPR that are very specific to this program and will help us understand the impact of these projects.

So although we are considering a single subaward entity and their one proposal that they submitted for approval to a potential grant recipient, there were actually two projects proposed in that one submission, the smart meters and the AI software for vegetation management. So we suggest that you actually treat these as two projects and use separate project tabs to answer this in the quarterly progress report. So project one will be the smart meters project, and project two will be the AI vegetation management software. This may sound like some extra work, but I promise you that it is not, and based on the design of the templates, will actually make things a lot easier to record and track information on projects going forward. So in this first section, you will immediately see the benefits of dividing the different technologies into two projects. So first, you'll see information asking about the number of customers served by the entity versus the number of customers that are benefiting from the project. In project number one, in

the case of the smart meters, there are 20,000 customers total for that Rural Electric Cooperative. But only 10,000 are benefiting from the project, because as we stated before, only 10,000 signed up to receive these new meters. Whereas, in the second project, there are still 20,000 customers benefiting from the project because it is a software platform designed to find all sections of lines that are most vulnerable to vegetation-related outages.

The next row shows category of provider, which is taken directly from the bipartisan infrastructure law, and in this case, the subaward entity for both projects is the same and is a distribution provider. And the last row shown asks for category of work for the project and how it should be classified, which comes directly, also, from section 40101 of IIJA. In the case of the first project on smart meters, these would be classified as monitoring and control technologies. And for the second project on vegetation management software, would be considered both an advanced modeling technology, because of the artificial intelligence component, and also a vegetation and fuel load management project.

Next, recipients are asked to identify project benefits where we have used categories of types of benefits to help us identify more broadly the expected impacts of these projects. In the case of smart meters, for example, they can reduce restoration time by notifying the utility exactly which meters are offline, which allows them to pinpoint the location of the outage much quicker than waiting for someone to report the outage. Additionally, as we pointed out, these are replacing old out-of-date meters which provides the added benefit of replacing aging infrastructure. And in this particular project, there was an added benefit that 60% of customers that signed up were located in one of those five census tracts listed as disadvantaged, which is noted as other and included, additionally, in the project benefit description.

The Vegetation Management Project, project number two, predominantly prevents outages from occurring by proactively addressing vegetation problem areas. So this would be considered preventing initial outages, which is highlighted and selected in the project benefit type section. Next, we look at the total budget. There are more detailed sections of costs requested in the QPR, but the section shown on this page identifies total budget breakdown. Since a small entity as defined by the statute proposed both projects, they are only required to provide a 1/3 cost match for the program, which you can see reflected in these tables.

Seeing and dividing up the funds like this allows us to determine how much money is required for labor versus equipment, for example. And this information can help establish trends in costs for similar project types, and provide a baseline for future investments. Finally, in the QPR, we see the build metrics table specifically.

This table provides a long list of potential build metrics to choose from in a dropdown list. And in this particular example, project one smart meters, we use the metric number of monitoring/metering devices installed from the dropdown list. In the type column, we add some more specific details such as the specific vendor and the device type. And then the goal value for this metric is 10,000, because we stated at the beginning of the project, the plan is to install 10,000 of these smart meters. The value during the reporting period identifies how many smart meters were installed during the specific quarter. And the cumulative value identifies how many have been installed to date. Additionally, for consideration in comparing annualized costs of resilience projects is including the expected lifetime of the equipment installed. And for meter devices, that is typically up to 15 years.

For project number two, for installing the vegetation management software system, the metric selected from the dropdown list is the percentage of the utility system migrated into this new AI system. The goal value in this case would be 100 representing 100% system migration so that the software is fully functional. So with all of that information we're going to collect on cost and project type, project benefit, and implementation milestones. What can we actually do with all of that information?

So although this is not an exhaustive list, some of the valuable information includes tracking total spending, benefiting disadvantaged communities, and cross-referencing that to expected project benefits, which means we can identify how much funding was spent on improving restoration time, or replacing aging infrastructure, for example, in disadvantaged communities. Additionally, we can help validate project costs.

We can compare cost per device, cost per pole, cost per kilowatt hour of all the projects funded through this grant program so you have a sense for what costs are reasonable and can spot gold plating in future proposals. Finally, we can determine which projects most recipients are leaning towards and which resilience benefits those projects provide. Next, we move to the annual program metrics and impact report. This report covers much of the impact and equity and community benefit metrics. So this report is required to be submitted within 30 days of the end of the federal fiscal year. However, for this fiscal year, FY23, since there are no projects that have been approved, at most, recipients may be able to submit this table. And they will only be able to do this if you have started using 5% of the funding set aside for technical assistance. This table is designed to get a better understanding of the types of assistance that recipients may fund.

For example, in this case, the recipient uses some of their 5% for technical analysis provided by a Department of Energy National Lab that helps the prime recipient select projects. Additionally, they use some of the funding to help facilitate better stakeholder coordination on project selection. The TA, technical assistance table, that I just described, is the only table provided on the recipient tab, and it applies for any assistance funded, regardless of the subawardee. The project tabs instead align with the specific projects outlined in the quarterly progress report.

So for example, project one was a smart meter project. And it will remain project one also in the annual program metrics and impact report. Project two was the vegetation management software solution, which will remain project two in the annual program metrics and impact report. So now we move into the impact section of this report. And if we remember from the metrics guidance framework, projects tend to have at least one of two goals, preventing outages from recurring, or reducing restoration time.

As we remember from the proposal, one of the benefits of smart meters was reducing restoration time. In this case, we are considering the commonly used reliability metric, CAIDI, which measures average time to restore power to a customer interrupted. In the first row, we consider comparing CAIDI values for all outages, pre- and post-meter implementation. This means that the metric selected from the dropdown list is CAIDI. The outage type that is selected is all causes, because smart meters can be beneficial in notifying the utility which customers have lost power, regardless of the cause. And finally, we want to track CAIDI for all outages and areas that have high adoption of smart meters to be able to see the benefits of more accurate outage tracking. In this case, we track feeders with 70% or higher adoption rates.

In the second row, we consider the same thing, except we're interested in major event days only, and we want to see if the smart meters have had an impact on reducing restoration time for extreme outage events. And finally the last row considers comparing average restoration time between low and high adoption feeders by also tracking CAIDI values for feeders with less than 40% of customers opting in to the smart meter program. To capture the before element of these metrics, we recommend including a five year baseline of the metrics of interest before project implementation, which is represented here on the slide. Next, we suggest that you collect the same exact metrics throughout the duration of project implementation and will be reporting on those metrics once every year.

And the second project, using the vegetation management software, the resilience goal is to reduce vegetation-related outages over the entire service territory. For example, some of the metrics you may want to consider include reducing the number of outages caused by vegetation safety values for vegetation, which measures the average number of customers interrupted in a certain time period, or even how much it costs to send crews to repair vegetation-related outages.

It is, however, important to note that because vegetation can damage power lines by being uprooted through high wind or flooding events, it is important to check with subrecipients how they are coding different outage causes. And you may also want to consider tracking storm-related outages as well to capture the full impact of vegetation management. Similar to before, we recommend collecting the same metrics before and during implementation. And although we will not be requesting data after the project is implemented, we believe it is highly beneficial to consider to continue to collect that information. Next, we get into the job quality questions which consist of primarily yes or no questions on training and labor relations. As we remember from the subaward proposal example, the smart

meter project hired two new employees to install meters. And additionally, these employees were also trained on the job to do this and filled out as such on the table on the left. On the right side, since the vegetation software project involves purchasing from a software vendor, no training related to the project was done, and all questions answered no for training. It is important to note answers to questions related to the subaward entity should be the same for both projects because they are implemented by the same entity. Next, this slide shows tables that ask similar style yes or no questions on labor and labor relations. One of the primary questions asks to report on the number of employees dedicated to the project, which is a requirement that will get passed on to the subcontractor in the case of project number two, the software vendor. And all questions related to the project are passed on to any subcontractors a subawardee may use.

This slide shows a sample of all the tables on demographics from the template. Due to space limitation on the slide, not all the demographics the Department of Energy is interested in are represented, which also include race, ethnicity, and veteran status. Shown on this slide are examples of gender and disability status. The sum of the people within each demographic category should add to the total number of employees. So for project one, has eight employees and trained two employees, which are represented on the graph on the left, while project two had 10 employees and no new training for projects, which is shown on the figure on the right.

The last major section of the annual impact report is the community engagement piece. For project one, we know that the smart meters were an opt-in program, and so they could potentially have used a community-based organization to help implement the opt-in program, which is noted in the sample table on community engagement activities at the bottom of the slide. Additionally, they would have likely had several information

sessions that targeted multiple communities of interest where those communities could sign up at the end of those meetings as shown as a sample in the community engagement events table at the top of the slide.

Project two in this example did not partner with a community organization. And so all the community engagement activities are selected as no in the table at the bottom of the slide. But they could have potentially held open information sessions on the benefits of AI-based management software. So we see in the table at the top of the slide that the type of community engagement for these events is no longer deferring to the customer but informing the customers about the projects where multiple communities of interest were targeted.

For those of you who have already looked through some of the reporting requirements, may have noticed we actually have two different templates for the annual report based on the funding amount. What I presented here reflects the reporting requirements for the larger award amount. And recipients with the smaller award amounts will still have questions related to resilience impact, training and labor, and community engagement, but will require fewer data points to reduce the burden of reporting on small award amounts.

Similar to the quarterly progress reports, there is a lot of useful information we can learn from the annual impact reports. First, in regards to resilience impact, we can track changes in metrics before and during implementation. I will, however, caution that typically, while a project is being implemented, you may actually see a slight decrease in performance, which is why we highly recommend recipients continue to ask for these metrics post project implementation.

We can also see trends in which project types are favored and for which outage causes. This can help us identify not only

hazard-specific mitigation strategies, but also no-regrets investments that can be beneficial in multiple outage scenarios. And finally, if you can take into account external factors impacting the severity of an outage such as wind speed or rainfall, there is potential to see the incremental benefits investments provide in reducing the impact of disruptions. Additionally, we can summarize the community benefits of the projects, such as identifying which entities are ensuring good quality jobs. We can see how much community buy-in and collaboration was involved in the development of these projects, as well as considering the people employed by this funding opportunity.

So I know that this presentation was likely like drinking from a fire hose, but if there are only a few things you take away from this webinar is, first, that you should understand your resilience goals before selecting metrics, use program objectives from your program narrative to guide metrics selection, when possible, subdivide subrecipient proposals into projects by technology type, before selecting metrics discuss with subrecipients the type of data they can collect, ensure reporting requirements are passed along to subrecipients-- so for example, you could consider including these templates in request for proposals or application-- and please, please, please, reach out to us if you have any questions. And so finally, I hope I persuaded at least some of you the value of metrics collection, because extreme disruptive events are not going anywhere, and they will continue to strain the electric grid investments beyond what can be funded through this program. And so as rates go up, being able to identify future lease costs but effective solutions starts with collecting the right data. So thank you all very much. And I now move it over to the Q&A section of the webinar.

WHITNEY BELL: Great. Thank you so much, Dave and Angelena. So as Angelena just said, we will have time for Q&A. So please submit your questions to the host via the chat box on the right. We have received just a couple, so feel free to keep adding them there. I'd also like to take this time to welcome some additional Grid Resilience Formula Grant staff to join us for the Q&A. We'll be joined by Jay Hannah with the National Energy Technology Laboratory, and Tom King with Oak Ridge National Laboratory. So as we're bringing them up here, I'm going to go ahead and get started with our first question.
So we've gotten two questions that are related. And this goes to Angelena for the first one. Someone said, where can I find the metrics tracking guidance document?

ANGELENA BOHMAN: Yes. Sorry, I'm waiting-- I no longer have control of the slides, so—

WHITNEY BELL: Here, we'll go to two right now.

ANGELENA BOHMAN: --on one of the early slides, it's on both the GDO and the NETL post award page. And the links to those are provided on the slide. And in one second, I will be able to move us to that slide. Here, so those hyperlinks are the hyperlinks that include the guidance for the metric tracking.
WHITNEY BELL: Great, thank you. Jay, this question is for you. The slides on the two projects appear to show a 50% match from non-Fed sources, not 30%. This person asked, did I misunderstand? I don't know if, Angelena, you can go to that slide either.

JAY HANNAH: Yeah, so the cost matches is originally stated in the agreements and the ALRD on the federal allocation to the state or the Indian tribe, that has to be matched 15% on the entire grant amount. And then, for individual resilience projects, the cost match is dependent upon the type of eligible entity. If it's a small utility which sells a lot more than

4,000,000 megawatts of electricity per year, or megawatt hours of electricity per year, then it's a 1/3 cost match. If it's a large utility, then it's a 100% cost match.

And those are minimum amounts. I think maybe in one of the examples, it might show, like, a 50% cost match. That could be a small utility, for example, that, for whatever reason, has paid more than the minimum 1/3 cost match. So yeah, that was a good pick up on that slide on your part. But if the cost match is what we have said it is all along, it's either 1/3 or 100%, depending on if it's a small utility or a large utility.

WHITNEY BELL: All right, thank you so much, Jay. Dave, this one is for you. Will GDO provide streamlined mechanisms/reporting tools for documenting and stepping through compliance with Build America By America, Davis-Bacon, NEPA, et cetera?

DAVE PARSONS: Yes, thank you for the question. We are working through the different tools that we may be able to offer to grant recipients to help streamline reporting for some of these compliance requirements. In particular, for Davis-Bacon, DOE is working on a software tool that will help with that requirement. I think for some of these other requirements I would say that-- work with your project officer with NETL. GDO is also there to help. We can help discuss what those requirements are, how to comply with them. And as we get more guidance and information from DOE, we can share that with all the grant recipients as well.

WHITNEY BELL: Great, thank you. Angelena, if we plan to let our funding accrue before developing our project, what are our reporting obligations?

ANGELENA BOHMAN: So both on the quarterly progress report and the annual impact metrics report, there will be a specific recipient tab. And so until projects are actually started, you

only need to fill out information on those recipient tabs. And
so that would be any sort of technical assistance you might
fund, or any other administrative funds that are still used as
part of the 5% that is allocated to all grant awardees, if you
happen to use any of that before selecting projects.

WHITNEY BELL: OK, thank you. Tom, I have a question here for
you. What should we do about data or metrics that subrecipients
deem proprietary or sensitive, i.e., outage data?

TOM KING: For the question, and as we go through this process,
there's going to be a lot of engagement with subrecipients. And
the first part is making sure there's good communication with
the subrecipients and understand what data is available, and
what some of the sensitive data there might be. But for the most
part, we're trying to do the best we can collecting this
information. If there is sensitive data that doesn't want to be
shared, through the conversations I think you'll be able to
identify some of the metrics that will be available to the
public. So it's part of the engagement process [INAUDIBLE] we
can to capture some of [INAUDIBLE] as we can.

WHITNEY BELL: All right. Jay, I have a couple questions here for
you. The first one is, states are expected to ask for
demographic information from-- I think it's, are states expected
to ask for demographic information from subrecipients? What if
the subrecipient or their contractors do not wish to report?

JAY HANNAH: I might defer to Angelena. We might have to get back
with you on that. But I believe, in general, demographic
information-- if a person does not want to report that
information they don't have to report it. So I think one
response can be does not report. Angelena, do you have anything
to add to that?

ANGELENA BOHMAN: So the demographic information is a requirement
that is coming through from the entire office of infrastructure

that is managing and overseeing all of the programs being funded through IIJA. But there is, ultimately-- there is always an option to say no designation or to not respond when collecting this information. And so we're just looking for as much information as we can get there.

WHITNEY BELL: Does the small project threshold apply to prime grant recipients? For example, states, subrecipients, for example, utilities, or both?

JAY HANNAH: So every project must be executed by what's called an eligible entity in the statute. And there are different types of eligible entities. And if a state or an Indian tribe wants to perform the project themselves, and it's not the tribal utility that's already the grant recipient, they can request to be designated an eligible entity. So if the state or Indian tribe were to implement the project itself and it wanted to get the reduced cost match, the 1/3 cost match, it would have to make a case that it's a small utility. And by that, they would have to sell not more than 4,000,000 megawatt hours of electricity per year.

So there's two things in that statement. One, you have to sell electricity. And two, you have to sell not more than 4,000,000 megawatt hours of electricity per year. So if a state or Indian tribe petitions to do the work itself, the project itself, as an eligible entity, the cost match, the 1/3 cost match or the 100% cost match, would be dependent upon whether or not they meet that definition of a small utility.

WHITNEY BELL: Thank you so much for clarifying that. Will subrecipients also have to provide information online?

JAY HANNAH: There is one online reporting requirement. And I don't think it was mentioned by Angelena. But when you go into the EERE PMC, the business point of contact and the principal

investigator have to fill out a very short demographic information sheet online. And again, one of the options is that you can choose not to report that information regarding your own personal demographic. Beyond that, it's just a matter of filling out the quarterly progress report and then that annual metrics report and submitting it online through the EERE PMC web portal.

ANGELENA BOHMAN: So I'll just add to that and say that there isn't a requirement to pass this on to the subrecipient. But a lot of the information, as you'll have seen in this webinar, is related to the subaward recipient. And so we highly recommend including these templates or asking them to fill out some of this information on your behalf before submitting it.

JAY HANNAH: Yeah, thanks for answering that, Angelena. I didn't see the word sub in subrecipient, so yes. Yeah, the subrecipients will report up through the state or Indian tribe.

WHITNEY BELL: All right, so I got a couple of questions here, but I'm going to just ask them one at a time. The first one, operationalizing the templates. We would need to be able to provide project-specific annual and quarterly report templates for each subawardee. When we go to add them into the state level quarterly/annual report, there are pop ups indicating table name issues. And the dropdown links break as well. Is there any way we can get versions of the QPR and annual report templates that are not password protected or for prime awardees to receive the password on these docs?

JAY HANNAH: Yeah, so I'm sort of rereading the question here. There's a lot to that question. So--

ANGELENA BOHMAN: Well, the first--

JAY HANNAH: Yeah.

ANGELENA BOHMAN: --thing I'll add is that some of the issues might be appearing if you're opening up the Excel files in a web link. And so downloading them and opening them up in Microsoft Excel helps fix some of those problems. But I refer to Jay on the locked sheets and whether or not those could be unlocked.

JAY HANNAH: I honestly don't know the answer to that question right now. But if whoever is asking that could send that question to their federal project officer, we will work with you to try to get you a document that you can use if you are having issues with the one that you're downloading. And then I know that some of the fields in the form are locked because they're formulas.

They're not things that you would fill in. They're actually formulas that are based on the other information you provide. And we don't want the template to be altered because we scrape information out of that template into a larger report. And if the reporting form is altered, it won't be able to be scraped into our database. So again, please reach out to your federal project officer. We'll work with you and make sure that you can get something that suits your needs that is still workable on our end.

WHITNEY BELL: So does DOE foresee reporting issues when projects address multiple activities? This person is concerned about duplication and reporting across activity types. Should we ask subawardees to identify/use the most relevant activity type for their project?

ANGELENA BOHMAN: Yeah, so this is why we recommend dividing out the projects by technology type. So if there's a single proposal that is including a lot of different, for example, hardening measures, being able to track those separately will make it a lot easier to fill those out. Alternatively, you can select multiple categories of work as they apply to a specific project type.

WHITNEY BELL: Angelena, how flexible is DOE with allowing the state to select their own reporting metrics that are not one of the metrics listed? And it seems that many of the metrics would only be available from the distribution company. If the state requests and receives approval to select a subrecipient that is not on the eligible entity list, what's the baseline and reporting metrics?

Will they have to report if they cannot access the data from the distribution company? That was a lot of information. If I need to reread it, please let me know.

ANGELENA BOHMAN: I think the first part of that question is-- sorry, now I'm trying to remember multiple parts-- related to the using alternative metrics. So yes, the dropdown list is merely provided as a way to help streamline this process if recipients are planning to use the eligible entities listed in the bill and try and make it easier. But you are always welcome to pick metrics that are more appropriate for the specific project types you are using.

There is an option for other in every single category. And we're happy to talk that out or work through that with you. And then when it comes to filling out baseline information, essentially the idea is to get as much information as you can. We completely understand there's a lot of limitations here. A lot of what was presented today is the goal of what we're trying to accomplish, but we'll work with you to discuss what is and is not possible based on who you are potentially subawarding to.

WHITNEY BELL: I have one more question here about metrics, impact metrics specifically. Where available, subawardees will have impact metrics that are reported on the calendar year. Please confirm that you are requesting the last five years' worth of baseline data based on the calendar year, specifically.

ANGELENA BOHMAN: Yeah, there's some opportunity in those spreadsheets to provide some specific information or qualifying information. And so we can add in some information that just says these are calendar year data as opposed to fiscal year data. It's fine.

WHITNEY BELL: I'm going to open-- I'm not exactly sure who should answer this one. So it says, on an earlier 4011D webinar, GDO mentioned that every subaward would need to be cleared before we could issue funds. Is that a full comprehensive review of every project attribute or just key items?

ANGELENA BOHMAN: It's probably a Jay question or a Dave question.

JAY HANNAH: So in your assistance agreement in the terms and conditions, there's a term that is called the Resilience Project Subaward Subcontract Notification. And it lists the items that you need to provide in the notification. The budget, it's the NEPA form, it's certain assurances that there's no conflicts of interest, that the subrecipient has not been debarred, and there's other questions like that. So I'll defer you to that term in your assistance agreement.

And then also, and maybe one of us can post it online, there's a template that you can use to provide-- you can fill it out as a PDF and provide it back to your project officer and that helps you, as you answer the questions, address all of the issues in that particular term of the assistance agreement. And it lists the additional attachments you would have to provide. So it's somewhat comprehensive, but there are things that are just required under financial assistance for us to approve and review before we can give the go ahead for you to proceed with the subaward.

And again, one of the most important ones would be the National Environmental Policies Act compliance, or NEPA compliance. If you recall, we did not require project-specific NEPA documentation in your application because nobody really had that information yet. So we're going to have to go through the NEPA process on a project by project basis as well. And that's part of that process.

WHITNEY BELL: Great. I have a question here for Dave. It looks like 29 tribes successfully applied for this funding and received approximately 1% of the total award. Has DOE considered changing the reporting requirements further to better reflect the award amounts? And any update on the year three allocation?

DAVE PARSONS: Yes, thank you for the question. I believe the slide that we shared was referring to the tribal applications that have been awarded so far. Many, many more tribes have applied for the funding but they have not yet-- they're still going through their compliance or technical reviews, the procurement process. And they will be awarded on a rolling basis as NETL completes those reviews and processes their applications. So it will be a larger number than the 29 that have so far been awarded. And I think this actually reflects awards that were made even prior to the deadline for applications.

So we received many more applications right up to the deadline. In terms of the year three allocation, we're working on that now. We're required by law to update the formula with the most recent data that's available, so we'll be working on that. And our hope is to be able to release the administrative and legal requirements document and the year three allocations later this winter for the next fiscal year of awards.

WHITNEY BELL: Great. I believe we are down to our final question unless something comes in. So I'm going to go ahead and ask

this. And this one looks like it should be addressed to Jay here. How should we reach out to our federal project officer? Is there a resource to assist us in identifying the metrics for our project as well as measuring them?

JAY HANNAH: So your federal project officer is identified on the cover sheet of your assistance agreement, so I think that the person's email address and contact information should be contained in that cover sheet. And you should have also, by now, have received an email from the project officer introducing him or herself to you. So hopefully you know who that person is. So probably the best way to do it is to just send an email and ask a question or ask to have a meeting scheduled. And the federal project officer can meet with you and answer with whatever questions that you may have. And if need be, at GDO, our headquarters office, yes, Dave and his team, they've been great about being part of a lot of these meetings that we have with the grant recipients to answer these questions. I think we've been very accommodating whenever anybody's needed assistance from both the project officers at NETL as well as the GDO.

WHITNEY BELL: All right. Well, that actually brings us to the end of our Q&A. So thank you to everyone for all those excellent questions. And thank you to you all for answering all of them. So that does wrap up today's webinar.

One last reminder. The presentation of today's webinar will be posted on the web page, and we will send you an email when that is ready. The recording will be available in about two weeks on that same page. And the link to this page can be found in the chat now, so we'll drop that in there momentarily.

The metrics guidance document discussed today can be found at the Grid Resilience State/Tribal Formula Grant Program web page. And that's at www.energy.gov/g do/gridresilience under post-

award resources. You can find the link to this web page in the chat now as well.

And then if you have any additional questions, please contact the Grid Deployment Office, specifically Angelena at the email address here on the screen. It's also angelena.bohman@hq.doe.gov. And you can also find this email link in the chat now as well.

So Angelena, Dave, Jay, and Tom, thank you so much for joining us today. And thank you to all of our attendees for participating. Take care everyone, and we will see you next time.